DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 263 CS 209 068

AUTHOR Olasky, Marvin N.
TITLE How the "Public Relations Journal" Responds to Criticism of Public Relations Ethics: A Qualitative Approach.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 23p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Content Analysis; *Ethics; *Journalism; Media Research; *Organizational Communication; Professional Associations; Public Opinion; *Public Relations; *Scholarly Journals
IDENTIFIERS *Public Relations Journal

ABSTRACT

A quantitative analysis of 40 years of articles appearing in the "Public Relations Journal" was made to determine how the journal has responded to ethical criticism of public relations over the years. While 17% of the articles during one eight-year period discussed questions touching on ethics in some way, quantitative analytical tools did not indicate the direction or depth of coverage. A qualitative analysis showed three periods in what could be called the "why-to" history of the journal. Discussion of ethnics during the first two periods--from 1945 to 1960 and 1961 to 1975--began with defense of public relations practices and mounted to criticism, but ended with debate cut off just as key ethical questions were raised. The third period, which began in 1976, has so far had less published criticism of public relations ethics, and more "PR" for "PR." Although public relations leaders point to the quantity of journal articles on ethics as a sign that criticisms are being taken seriously, qualitative analysis shows the superficiality of all but a few articles. Essential issues have been ignored, and little interest in examining basic questions is evident among leaders of the field. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED258263

HOW THE PUBLIC RELATIONS JOURNAL RESPONDS TO CRITICISM OF PUBLIC RELATIONS ETHICS: A QUALITATIVE APPROACH

By

Dr. Marvin N. Olasky
Department of Journalism
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712

1985

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS 209 068

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marvin N. Olasky

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HOW THE PUBLIC RELATIONS JOURNAL RESPONDS TO CRITICISM OF PUBLIC RELATIONS ETHICS: A QUALITATIVE APPROACH

This year the Public Relations Journal, official organ of the Public Relations Society of America, is celebrating its fortieth anniversary. A quantitative analysis of how the journal has responded to ethical criticism of public relations over the years produced results of limited usefulness: While 17% of the articles during one eight-year period discussed questions touching on ethics in some way, quantitative analytical tools did not indicate the direction or depth of coverage.

A qualitative analysis showed three periods in what could be called the "why-to" history of the journal. Discussion of ethics during the first two periods -- 1945 to 1960 and 1961 to 1975 -- began with defense of public relations practices and mounted to criticism, but ended with debate cut off just as key ethical questions were raised. The third period, which began in 1976, has so far had less published criticism of public relations ethics, and more "PR for PR."

Although public relations leaders point to the quantity of journal articles on ethics as a sign that criticisms are being taken seriously, qualitative analysis shows the depressing superficiality of all but a few articles. Essential issues have been ignored. Little interest in examining basic questions is evident among leaders of the field, but new entrants may demand changes.

HOW THE PUBLIC RELATIONS JOURNAL RESPONDS TO CRITICISM OF PUBLIC RELATIONS ETHICS: A QUALITATIVE APPROACH

This year the Public Relations Journal, official organ of the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA), is celebrating its fortieth anniversary. Leading trade journals, like major textbooks, are vital for passing on the received wisdom of an occupation. This is particularly true in fields such as public relations which are both poorly defined and under attack for reputedly justifying unethical activities. A key question, therefore, naturally arises: Has the Public Relations Journal (henceforth PRJ) responded to the abundant criticism of public relations since 1945, or attempted to ignore it?

One way of approaching this type of study could be through quantitative analysis. A categorizing of PRJ articles shows that two kinds have dominated the monthly's pages. One kind, by far the majority, could be called the "how-to" -- mechanics of producing annual reports and press releases, uses of new technology, and so on. The other kind could be called the "why-to" -- articles which attempt to define the purpose of public

relations, examine questions of "professionalism" and ethics, or evaluate the overall reputation of public relations compared with what some feel that reputation should be.

Quantitative analysis shows that 15 to 20 percent of articles year after year have been in the "why-to" category. For instance, during the eight years from 1957 through 1964, 634 articles were primarily "how-to" -- 41 on the use of audio visual materials, eight on the planning of anniversary celebrations, and so on -- while 126 (17% of the total of 760) were "why-to," with subjects such as "What Does Professionalism Mean?" and "Why Should Service Be Emphasized?"

The 15 to 20 percent level for "why-to" questions is impressive for a publication that might be expected to emphasize even more the "how-to." After all, studies of preferences by most magazine editors in other fields have shown an overwhelming preference for "nuts-and-bolts" articles rather than examinations of ethics. In response to criticism that PRSA cares little about ethics, the organization's leaders have even cited the "openness" of PRJ over the years. A standard PRSA defense could be paraphrased as, "Our journal has dealt with criticism, and we have the numbers to prove it."

A careful qualitative analysis -- reading the ethics articles to see exactly how criticisms are dealt with -- helps us to go beyond arithmetical apologia. Such an analysis indicates three periods in PRJ's "why-to" history. Discussion of ethics during the first two periods -- 1945 to 1960, and 1961 to 1975 --

began with defense of public relations practices and mounted to criticism, but ended with debate cut off just as key ethical questions were raised. Those two cycles lasted for about 15 years each. The third period, which began in 1976, has so far had less published criticism of public relations ethics, and more "PR for PR," but a new feature beginning with the February, 1985, issue, indicated that history might be about to repeat itself, possibly with variations.

First fifteen years, 1945-1960

During the late 1940s and early 1950s PRJ articles often asked whether public relations "professionalism" could best be attained by concentrating on better dissemination of information or better techniques of persuasion. For instance, one article from 1949 concentrated on the possibilities for persuasion through "voluntary hypnotism," since "We have all observed the frenzy of people attending a ball game or a race. The worship of screen stars or political leaders indicates how little we have progressed from the social pattern of primitive tribes." Author Karl Ettinger pointed out an opportunity to learn from the techniques of certain non-corporate practitioners: "We know how the medicine man puts his audience in a state of trance by such means as rhythmic drum-beating and monotonous incantations... Modern molders of public opinion will give top priority to the problem of group genesis and emotional identification of the individual with a group." But Ettinger titled that article Sorcerer's Apprentice, perhaps indicating some doubt as to where

such social control might lead.[1]

Two other types of articles made frequent appearances during the early and middle 1950's. One kind was filled with complaints that public relations practitioners were not taken seriously within some businesses. For instance, William T. Bostleman in 1950 told how "the public relations man, having been rebuffed in his initial attempt to sell a program, apparently knuckles under, swallows his pride, and follows through with whatever watered-down, weak-kneed, spurious imitation that management thinks it should have. He cuts the cloth to fit the pattern. He has to eat, of course."[2] Similarly, Gordon Hendry worried in 1953 that "A certain utilities company regards public relations as a kind of ornament. Almost every vice president has his public relations assistant. It is a decorative device; a plume to preen the vanity. One can almost hear the vice president saying to his wife: 'By George, if Bertrand can have a public relations man, I can too.'"[3]

During the mid-1950s, though, PRJ articles began warning practitioners of popular concern that public relations was becoming too effective; PRJ readers were cautioned not to talk too much about manipulative practices. For instance, Dan Forrestal argued that, "...It's bad public relations, in my view, for a public relations man to imply that he is Svengali and that the public is his Trilby."[4] PRJ's difficult mixture of advice -- act decisively to show management what public relations can do, but do not indicate pride in your triumphs -- led to a certain confusion in the ranks. An article in 1957 entitled

"That 'Engineering' Problem" showed uneasiness. Author A.L. Powell was upset by the criticism public relations men and women received for attempting to "engineer consent," but his article ended with a sputtering of indecision: "If we do not have a role of -- well, if not the engineering of consent-- the obtaining of good will, what are we here for?"[5]

Question-asking of that sort culminated in two articles during 1957 and 1958 by public relations manager J. Carroll Bateman, who argued that basic goals of practitioners had to change if they were ever to win greater public acceptance. Bateman wrote that, "To ourselves and to others we have too long-- and perhaps wrongly-- held ourselves out as 'molders of public opinion,' or to put it more bluntly, as professional persuaders. Persuasion is a means rather than an end."[6] Bateman criticized attempts to "Sell the sizzle, not the steak," by asking, "How long will it continue to work? Haven't we already perceived a deterioration of public confidence in communication that deals with sizzles instead of steaks? If those of us who are professionally engaged in the art of communication will not devise messages that inform and educate our audiences, are we not helping to degrade them?"[7]

Following Bateman's initial attack, though, PRJ editors may have realized that he was striking too close to the essence of the occupation, and a run of defensiveness began. Articles argued that PR ethics were adequate, and that in any case a time of financial growth for the occupation was no time to get self-

critical. For instance, John E. Normoyle argued against "unrealistic pipe-dreams" which could "inhibit the objective reasoning necessary at this stage."[8] Questioning of ethics was called in PRJ "dreamy speculation" which could lead to an "orgy of self-examination." The last years of the decade saw the orgy averted, with PRJ readers simply informed that a new era of "professionalism" had begun.[9]

Second fifteen years, 1961-1975

During the early 1960s, the prevailing attitude of PRJ writers on ethics was that "why-to" questions could get in the way of efficient "how-to." Dennis Altman, for instance, urged public relations practitioners to dump any concern about "intangibles" and instead create a new, improved "image of smartness, Machiavellian smartness..."[10] Andrew Lazarus equated discussion of ethical questions with "contemplating our navels" and wrote that the goal of PR men and women should be simply "to make money -- for their management, their clients and themselves."[11]

Throughout the 1960s most PRJ why-to authors emphasized practical success rather than questions of facticity or honesty. Philip Lesly wrote, "In the arena of present 'attitude management,' not the facts but the impression people get of a situation is the real reality."[12] Many other articles told practitioners that they should not confuse public relations with the provision of public information; "attitude management" was the key, and any who doubted that were harming the

"professionalization" of public relations. For instance, S. Ralph Dubrowin decried "disrespect for PR" from those who objected to the attempt to mold minds." Public relations counselors are "business psychiatrists," Dubrowin insisted, "and in the process of evolving our plans and seeing them through the intellectually booby-trapped environment in which we constantly operate, we are practicing what could be called Business Psychiatry."[13]

While most PRJ why-to pages emphasized psychology, a series of cheerleading editorials attempted to knock down nagging doubts. A typical attempt in 1972 to buck up the bedraggled began as follows: "Sorely-needed and frequently lacking in public relations practitioners is a feeling of pride in our field. Too many public relations men and women are on the defensive when we and the function through which we earn a livelihood and serve society are attacked or disparaged by critics who look down on us and our profession as being of doubtful value to anyone but ourselves and our clients....You have the responsibility to put the critic right, to make him understand that you have genuine pride in what you do and how you do it."[14]

PRJ articles during the early 1970s generally attempted to instill pride based on in-group status rather than rethinking of occupational goals. A typical title was, "The Coming Age of the PR Man," and every new development was seen primarily as an opportunity for public relations practitioners to "propagate the faith." For example, an article on "social responsibility" told

practitioners that "...the increasing corporate concern and commitment in the social area is giving corporate PR people a much stronger story to communicate. But more importantly, it is providing PR professionals with new opportunity for highest-level involvement and responsibility... there is going to be a big brass ring up for grabs in many American companies in the next decade."[15]

Along with praise for those who saluted the public relations flag came verbal harassment of those proposing alternatives. "Align PR to Management Needs--Or Prepare to Abandon the Corporate Ship," a typical PRJ headline read. Dan Forrestal insisted that "the temptation to be noble forever lurks in the hearts of men," but it had to go.[16] A PRJ editorial proposed a ban on critics of public relations ethics: "Unless we can stand up and say, 'I am proud to be in public relations,' we are likely to lack confidence and may feel ashamed of ourselves and our field of work. In that event, we do not belong in the field and will do a kindness to all right-thinking public relations men and women if we enter upon another type of activity."[17]

Perhaps due to the public relations fallout from Watergate, three articles which criticized typical public relations practice did appear during 1974 and 1975. In 1974, as Richard Nixon was resigning, PRJ ran Donald Danko's proposal for a different "perspective on corporate communication." Danko wrote that, "Credibility suffers because many corporate communications programs are laden with half-truths: 'Tell the public only the

good news and when the news isn't good, tell them nothing or as close to nothing as legally permissible.' As far as the bad news goes-- 'What! Release information that could be harmful to our profit picture when we don't have to? You can't be serious.'" Danko noted that such one-sidedness means that "news releases become newsroom standing jokes."[18]

A second article during the post-Watergate period also approached a key point, then double-clutched and lost the opportunity. Pierre Werka observed, "It would be comforting to believe that the barrier standing between us and better PR for PR is the fringe operator. But often the fringe operator is no more guilty of presenting a blurred picture than the upstanding, honorable practitioner." Werka noted, "Suppose a major national magazine were to print a feature story saying all the things we'd like to have said about the virtues of public relations. Would this counteract the opinion of a local editor being pressured to run non-news? Hardly."[19]

The third article in this flurry was a 1975 piece by Arthur Cuervo, who complained that "mainstream practitioners engage in the engineering of consent that helps to mold public opinion to the profitable interest of the client at the expense of the public good," and take pride in doing so. Cuervo described the tendency "to blame the quacks in the field" and to say, "throw the rascals out and all will be right with the world of public relations." He noted that such a convenient placing of blame did not get to the core of the problem, for "<u>At the top of the PR enemies list should be the practitioners themselves.</u>" Cuervo

argued that, "To truly change its image, public relations must begin to take ethics seriously."[20]

Just as in the late 1950s, though, most PRJ writers on ethics reacted to this basic critique not with a willingness to reform, but with a desire to cover up. As the going got rough, the cheerleading intensified: All would be well if there were only more "PR for PR." PRSA President Jay Rockey emphasized that slogan and added, "It is essential, moreover, if we are to propagate the faith, if we are to build a more receptive state of mind to public relations in these United States, that all of us as individuals pursue this objective with intensified zeal and dedication."[21]

That the two periods were fifteen years each may be coincidental. The critical determinant appears to be an unwillingness to examine in depth basic problems: Each time the lid was opened, only to be quickly slammed shut.

Third period: 1976-?

With a renewed emphasis on closing ranks, most of the late 1970s and early 1980s why-to sections of PRJ make for dull reading. Pride that "the art of fine-tuning your target publics is becoming a science"[22] is followed by argument against "the traditional advice to be open, honest, and candid."[23] Rationalizations such as the following are typical: "While the true professional should be willing to put his or her job on the line over ethical decision-making considerations, this is

perhaps too ideological a position concerning reality. Indeed, if public relations people did terminate positions that forced them to compromise their ethical standards, managements and clients probably would have little difficulty replacing them with other communicators who had lower standards of morality."[24]

Early during this period, one PRJ article called for a qualitative improvement in ethical examination. Allen Center wrote in 1976, "If we really cared what happened to public relations as a career, we'd be talking and hearing more about situations in which public relations consultants or resident officers resigned over such questions as who should be calling the public relations shots, or an honest conflict of convictions on strategy and tactics. We'd be hearing more about consultants who referred a prospective client elsewhere rather than risk their own reputation serving that client, or doing the particular chore he wanted done."[25] But readers of PRJ during the past nine years have rarely been hearing about that. Instead, PRJ's questioner on ethics during the late 1950s, J. Carroll Bateman, noted in his personal records for 1980 the continued appropriateness of a comment he had made in PRJ seven years before: "One had the feeling that he was on a huge merry-go-round in time, that he had heard it all before... and that in reality no genuine progress had been made in the public relations profession over the years."[26]

Not only was there little genuine progress, but PRJ why-to articles during the late 1970s increasingly seemed to stress the "positive" side of manipulating "group attitudes" -- in the

"public interest," of course. PRJ gave extensive coverage to a 1978 PRSA "Long Range Planning Committee" conclusion that "the stability of our society depends on bringing into reasonable equilibrium the many social, political, and cultural forces-- all of which are determined by group attitudes. Group attitudes are the special milieu of public relations. Top public relations people have special contributions to make, involving these forces, that cannot be made by others." Succeeding articles in PRJ made it clear that those "special contributions" were largely propagandistic in nature, with ethics thrown out the window in the attempt to influence "group attitudes."[27]

While PRJ fiddled through the 1970s, little improvement in the reputation of public relations was registered. Public relations remained an occupation in disgrace. Public relations men and women continued to be labeled "high-paid errand boys and buffers for management," "tools of the top brass," "hucksters," "parrots," "awed by the majesty of their organization charts," "desperate, impotent, evasive, egomaniacal, and lying." Public relations was still described as "dangerous," based on lying or at least "telling half the truth." A survey of fifty practitioners at one of the ten largest U.S. corporations showed many public relations veterans reluctant to talk with their families about what they did at work.[28]

Belatedly responding to the sense of stagnation, PRSA reports published in PRJ during 1981 acknowledged that the public relations field was "now confronted with critical

questioning. Its practitioners are questioning its status and role as pointedly as outsiders." The reports noted "barriers to acceptance" that public relations faces, including this one:

> Public relations' projection of itself has concentrated on how it gets things done by changing people's attitudes...As a result, the public's perception is that public relations is aimed at them, not for their benefit; that they are the object of public relations, not the beneficiaries. People naturally resent what they perceive as efforts to manipulate their thinking, to move them in directions for others' benefit rather than their own....At a time when the public is averse to manipulation of its attitudes, an approach that treats the public as a target creates a backlash.29

However, no indication of basic rethinking of prevalent public relations ethics was present. For instance, on one page of the report published in PRJ. PRSA members were told that the "segmentation method" of manipulating particular publics by developing special appeals (sometimes contradicting the others) for each public was "outdated." On the following page, the "segmentation method" was praised as a way of "educating the public about the role of public relations."[30] Most discussion of ethical questions seemed to emphasize ways of rephrasing typical maneuvers to make them "appear" more ethical. For instance, PR men and women were told that they should not talk about plans to "master the publics," but should instead emphasize their desire "to achieve mutual adaptations."[31]

Signs of change, perhaps, were evident in the February, 1985, issue of PRJ. Editor Michael Winkleman announced:

> This issue marks the debut of our Ethics column: a special sort of column for the Public Relations Journal, and a harbinger of things to come in these pages.

> Much of what you'll find in PRJ, particularly in our columns, fits under the rubric of news, analysis, and service: What are the new technologies? What are the trends in sponsored films and audiovisuals?...But ethics is different. It's fraught with gray areas, with soul-searching, with hard thinking about issues...PRJ's ethics columns will seek not so much to provide guidance as to wrestle with demons...We're expecting our readers to contribute their own vignettes, their tales of ethical dilemmas and long sessions of doubt, questioning, and even remorse.32

The first ethics column was an overview by PRSA official Donald McCammond, complete with generalization about "heightened awareness of ethical imperatives" and observation that "discussion and debate on the topic of ethics at conferences, luncheon conversations, and even cocktail parties seems to have increased."[33] But Editor Winkleman insisted in that February issue that change would come to PRJ:

> In May we're launching an Opinion column. Like Ethics, this column will be open for reader contribution. And, we expect, it will be soul-searching, hard-hitting, controversial, and, as befits its title, opinionated.
>
> Soul-searching, hard-hitting, and controversial are some of the key words that guide our editorial meeting these days....Look for more issues and controversy, more dilemmas and problems, more soul-searching and hard-hitting, thought-provoking writing in these pages as the months go on.34

It is easy to be tiredly cynical about this attempt. After all, similar-sounding phrases during the late 1950s and the mid-1970s eventually led nowhere. But history does not always repeat itself, or if it does, different emphases may develop: The first time tragedy, the second time farce, perhaps the third time some improvement.

Conclusion

Forty years of PRJ have produced a quantitatively-impressive but qualitatively-depressing body of articles on questions of public relations ethics. The depressing superficiality of all but a few articles makes it impossible to take seriously claims that ethical problems have been taken seriously at PRJ. A list of the essential and important issues generally ignored would include:

o The most frequent excuse for deception given by public relations practitioners: Our lies counterbalance the lies of others. Sissela Bok, in her book Lying, noted that such claims are extraordinarily prone to misinterpretation and bias: "Even if it were right to reciprocate in this way, it is often hard to know when others are lying. Even those who want to return the deception they encounter are bound to make mistakes. If we feel free to deceive those we suspect of having lied, we are likely to invite vast increases in actual deception..."[35] The supply curve of lies pushes up the demand curve, and vice versa.

o The ethics and consequences of viewing questions of public information in adversary terms. As Bok observed, "All too often, the lie directed at adversaries is a lie to friends as well." Even lies invoking self-defense, or organizational defense, tend to backfire, since "self defense lies can permeate all one does, so that life itself turns into 'living a lie.'"[36]

o The effect of public relations manipulation on public relations men and women themselves. Practitioners interviewed in

one study contended that the road to public relations success lies through manipulation of public opinion -- for the public good, of course, and only to counteract the negative publicity which enemies have provided. But Bok noted the repercussions of such practice: Those "involved in collective practices of deceit give up all ordinary assumptions about their own honesty and that of others."[37]

o The claim of harmlessness. Bok observed that even small distortions have an effect, for "Lies tend to spread. Disagreeable facts come to be sugar-coated."[38] Even the apparently trivial has a cumulative impact, for acceptance of small lies leads to acceptance of large lies, and those who have been lied to in large ways tend to consider lying to others the only way to travel, in a natural reaction to disappointment.

o The effect of "manipulating public opinion" on American society generally. Political movements of the 1970s (which have continued into the 1980s) show, in Bok's words, that "millions of the lied-to are now resentful, disappointed, and suspicious. They feel wronged; they are wary of new overtures. And they look back on their past beliefs and actions in the new light of the discovered lies. They see that they were manipulated, that the deceit made them unable to make choices for themselves according to the most adequate information available, unable to act as they would have wanted to act had they known all along."[39]

Will public relations men and women face up to the problems? Will there be another upsurge at PRJ, perhaps larger than those

small swells of the past?

Some signs of a public relations upheaval are now apparent, yet paychecks placate the pained, and a lack of perceived alternatives creates caution. Quantitatively, public relations sometimes seems to function on the principle of "the worse, the better," with disasters leading to an expansion of job opportunities. For instance, one public relations textbook noted that, "The events at Three Mile Island did not reflect well on public relations practitioners," but a "bright spot" was "the boon Three Mile Island provided to public relations."[40] The wages of deception appear bountiful to those without full knowledge of the consequences.

Stil, new attempts at discussion are apparently beginning at PRJ. Furthermore, the perhaps atypical impression of this writer, after teaching eight classes of public relations students during the past two years, and advising a major university chapter of the Public Relations Student Society of America, is that new entrants into the public relations field are not satisfied with the stones offered by PRJ over the years. They hunger for bread.

If their desire for more substantial discussion of ethical problems is taken seriously, during the next few years we might expect to see a larger quantity of PRJ articles on the continuing ethical dilemmas of the field. Only careful reading will show whether these articles exhibit any qualitative difference.

Footnotes

1. Public Relations Journal, October, 1949, pp. 30-31.
2. Ibid., May, 1950, pp. 11-12.
3. Ibid., September, 1953, p. 5.
4. Ibid, June, 1957, p. 3.
5. Ibid, October, 1957, pp. 11-12.
6. Ibid., March, 1957, p.8.
7. Ibid., August, 1958, p. 17.
8. Ibid., June, 1958, p. 23.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid., February, 1963, p. 7.
11. Ibid., September, 1963, p. 6.
12. Ibid., December, 1969, p. 8.
13. Ibid., October, 1971, p. 34.
14. Ibid., October, 1972, p. 2.
15. Ibid., November. 1972, p. 66.
16. Ibid., October, 1971, pp. 40-41.
17. Ibid., October, 1972, p. 2.
18. Ibid., August, 1974, p. 10.
19. Ibid., February, 1975, p. 24.
20. Ibid., July, 1975, pp. 12-13.
21. Ibid., February, 1976, pp. 17, 29.
22. Ibid., April, 1981, p. 4.
23. Ibid., September, 1978, p. 54.
24. Ibid., December, 1982, p. 15.
25. Ibid., January, 1976, p. 13.
26. Ibid., June, 1973, p. 36. Also see Bateman archives at the Barker Texas History Center, The University of Texas at Austin.

27. Ibid., September, 1978, p. 54.

28. Kenneth Henry, Defenders and Shapers of the Corporate Image (New Haven: College and University Press, 1972), pp. 89-90. Peter M. Sandman, David M. Rubin, David B. Sachsman, Media: An Introductory Analysis of American Mass Communications (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976), p. 367; quoted in Carolyn Cline, "The Image of Public Relations in Mass Comm Texts," Public Relations Review, Fall, 1982, p. 63. Also M.N. Olasky, "The Amoral World of Public Relations," Business and Society Review, Winter, 1985, pp. 41-44.

29. Public Relations Journal, March, 1981, pp. 24, 27, 34; April, 1981, p.4. One positive note about the task force's report: It included some common sense comments about the ethical pretension of calling public relations a profession: "The question of whether public relations is a profession or on the verge of becoming one is not germane to our considerations. The extensive attention this matter has received reflects the inward orientation of the field that has dominated much of its history. The benefits of esteem as professionals will result from how the publics perceive public relations practitioners, not what they claim to be. In recent years aspiration to be called a 'profession' has become endemic in our society. Countless crafts have, in this age of permissiveness, taken on themselves the claim of being 'professions,' to the point where the term has little meaning except for a few fields that the public has long considered to be professions." (pp. 26-7)

30. Ibid., p. 34.

31. Ibid., p. 36.

32. Ibid., February, 1985, p. 3.

33. Ibid., p. 8.

34. Ibid., p. 3.

35. Sissela Bok, Lying (New York: Random House, 1978), p. 134.

36. Ibid., p. 149.

37. Ibid., p. 79.

38. Ibid., p. 61.

39. Ibid, pp. 20-21. While aware of the downward spiral, some practitioners continue to think they can be free riders forever. As Bok notes, liars "may believe, with Machiavelli, that 'great things' have been done by those who have 'little regard for good faith.' They may trust that they can make wise use of the power that lies bring. And they may have confidence in their own ability to distinguish the times when good reasons support their

decision to lie... They may invoke special reasons to lie-- such as the need to protect confidentiality or to spare someone's feelings." Yet Bok notes a certain inevitable distortion here: "In this benevolent self-evaluation by the liar of the lies he might tell, certain kinds of disadvantage and harm are almost always overlooked. Liars usually weigh only the immediate harm to others from the lie against the benefits they want to achieve. The flaw in such an outlook is that it ignores or underestimates two additional kinds of harm-- the harm that lying does to liars themselves and the harm done to the general level of trust and social cooperation. Both are cumulative; both are hard to reverse." (pp. 23-24)

40. Fraser Seitel, The Practice of Public Relations, second edition (Columbus, Ohio: Chas. E. Merrill, 1984), p. 401.